

DD/A Registry

File

6 July 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR: DDCI Designate

FROM : John F. Blake
Deputy Director for Administration

STATINTL

1. If you will permit me, I would like to register a minor bleat.

2. I address myself to your memorandum of 28 June to the Director of Personnel on "Consideration of Job Applicants." I do believe that from two different points of view the correspondence should have been directed to me, but I was not even on distribution for it. The first reason I believe it should have been sent to me, personally, was one part of the memorandum addresses itself to the composition of the Applicant Review Panel, such Panel now being staffed by personnel from three Offices of this Directorate. Secondly, as it pertains to the other part of the memorandum, the handling of the applicant case of [REDACTED] it would appear from my understanding of the case that the Office of Security maybe could have handled it in a little different fashion.

STATINTL

3. I propose to make a copy of your memorandum available to both the Office of Security and the Office of Medical Services as I wish to solicit the advice of both Mr. Gambino and Dr. Bohrer concerning the suggestion to add representation from the Office of Equal Employment Opportunity to the Applicant Review Panel. Because of the sensitive nature of some of the security information on applicants and because of the privileged nature of some medical information on some applicants, I wish to proceed very cautiously before taking a position on adding representation to the Applicant Review Panel.

/s/ John F. Blake

John F. Blake

Distribution:

Orig - DDCI Designate

1 - D/OP w/o Ref (DDA 76-3345)

1 - D/OS w/att

Approved For Release 2001/07/30 : CIA-RDP79-00498A000500140007-4

Dist Distribution Not

DDA:JFBlake:der

1 - DDA Subject STATINTL DDA Chrono
1 - JFB Eyes Only Chrono

☐ UNCLASSIFIED☒ INTERNAL
USE ONLY☐ CONFIDENTIAL☐ SECRET

Approved For Release 2001/07/30 : CIA-RDP79-00498A000500140007-4

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

FROM:

Chief, OP/SAS
401 Magazine

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE

1 July 1976

STATINTL

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

OFFICER'S
INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. OP/EA
5E58 HQ

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

Bob,

STATINTL

Per your request, I have jotted down a few thoughts regarding Mr. [REDACTED] memorandum. I did not mention that the number of times the Panel calls an office and relays employment information as mentioned in paragraph three is quite small. We estimate that it happens about 12 times per year.

I believe that the Director of Security and the Director of Medical Services should be given an opportunity to express their views concerning the adding of an EEO representative to the Panel. As you know, those two offices supply the very sensitive information which we deal with and in the past they have been most concerned that that information will be disseminated beyond the Panel members. It was for that reason that Mr. Gambino refused to discuss the [REDACTED] case with Omega Ware, which probably started this issue in the first place.

[REDACTED] STATINTL

1. In 1953 the Acting Deputy Director (Administration), L. K. White, set up what is now known as the Applicant Review Panel. He wrote in a memorandum directed to the Directors of Personnel and Security and the Chief, Medical Staff that "It is important that marginal administrative information which may lead to the decision that an individual applicant is not suitable for appointment be pooled and coordinated among these offices and subjected to systematic evaluation before a decision affecting appointment is made. Marginal administrative information may be data which is incidental to the information developed by an office to enable it to apply the employment standards for which it has responsibility; it may be data which is of such character that standing alone it does not justify a decision to reject an applicant for employment. Occasionally, information of this kind acquires greater significance when related to other marginal information in the possession of other offices."

2. As you know, the Applicant Review Panel does not approve or reject employment applications. The Panel does make recommendations to the Directors of

Security and Medical Services that an application be approved and to the Director of Personnel that an application be rejected. The final decision in each case rests with the Directors of those support offices.

3. As the work of the Applicant Panel has progressed since 1953, it has become evident that another type of information is sometimes obtained, especially by the Office of Security. Information which is not strictly of a suitability character but has to do with whether or not an employee can satisfactorily perform his proposed assignment. As an example, an applicant for NPIC will probably be asked to work in a building without windows. As a result of the background investigation, the Office of Security may learn that the applicant is unable to work in a windowless building. The Panel has relayed that type of information to the head of the office concerned who may decide to cancel his interest in the applicant. Another example may involve a Commo applicant who will be required to perform field duty, but the Office of Security has discovered that the employee has a personal problem which will not permit him to accept an overseas assignment. The Panel feels that this information should be relayed to the Director of Communications.

STATINTL

In my opinion, the Panel would agree with paragraph three of Mr. [REDACTED] memorandum that "there may be good reason for the hiring office to change its view upon receipt of such information, but the applicant may have such overall strength that his services should not be lost to other components within the Agency." It is for that very reason that the Applicant Panel is reluctant to recommend Agency-wide rejection of an application before Staff Personnel Division has a chance to review it and to determine whether or not some other component may have an interest in it.

4. As Chairman of the Applicant Review Panel and a representative of the Director of Personnel, I do not think it would be well-advised to broaden the Panel to include a representative from the Office of EEO or any other office that might have a special interest. The Panel is attempting to concern itself with suitability type information. As far as the Personnel representative is concerned, he is not aware of the race or the religion of an applicant under discussion. As you know, pictures are no longer included in the applicant file and there are no PHS questions concerning race or religion. It would appear that an EEO Representative would tend to bring those items into focus.

SENDER WILL CHECK CLASSIFICATION TOP AND BOTTOM			
UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL	
		SECRET	
OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP			
TO	NAME AND ADDRESS	DATE	INITIALS
1	DD/Pers	29 JUN 1976	[Signature]
2	D/Pers		J
3			
4			
5			
6			
ACTION		DIRECT REPLY	PREPARE REPLY
APPROVAL		DISPATCH	RECOMMENDATION
COMMENT		FILE	RETURN
CONCURRENCE		INFORMATION	SIGNATURE
Remarks:			
<p>DDCI designate suggests an EEO Rep on [redacted] applicant review panel to ensure due regard to minorities, etc.</p> <p>SUGGEST D/PERS WILL WANT TO HAVE [redacted] OUT SOON TO DISCUSS.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">RDK</p>			
FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER			
FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.			DATE
Ends list to D/Pers			29 JUN 1976
UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL	
		SECRET	


FORM NO. 1-67

237

Use previous editions

(40)

Approved For Release 2001/07/30 : CIA-RDP79-00498A000500140007-4



28 June 1976

76-1777/A

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Personnel
SUBJECT: Consideration of Job Applicants

STATINTL

1. Thank you for your information concerning the case of [REDACTED]. In looking into the background, there are several things that concern me and I would like your consideration of the following. Let me know your reactions.

STATINTL

2. The Office of Security in this case apparently provided the Office of Weapons Intelligence with certain background information which seems to have had the effect of changing OWI's consideration of hiring [REDACTED].

3. It seems to me preferable, in matters of this kind, that information available to the Office of Security, the Office of Medical Services or the Office of Personnel, which relates to the advisability of hiring, should be considered by the Applicant Review Panel in order to get the full benefit of exchange of information among members of the panel. One of my problems here is that the direct supply of unevaluated information from any one of those three offices to an office considering hiring is to decentralize the process to too great an extent. There may well be good reason for the hiring office to change its view upon receipt of such information, but the applicant may have such overall strength that his services should not be lost to other components within the Agency.

4. I think, too, that we would be well-advised to broaden the Applicant Review Panel to include representation from the Office of EEO. This will insure not only a due regard for minority rights and privileges but for the rights and privileges of all regardless of race, creed or color.

STATINTL

Attachment:

6/28 Janney Note to [REDACTED]
6/17 Memo for [REDACTED] from Ware

STATINTL

STATINTL

Approved For Release 2001/07/30 : CIA-RDP79-00498A000500140007-4

17 June 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR: Mr. [REDACTED]

STATINTL

SUBJECT : OWI Rejection of Applicant for Employment

1. I have talked to the Chairman of the Applicant Panel and, as you said, the Panel did not reject this applicant. The information which the Panel turned over to OWI apparently included information which, while cause for concern, was not necessarily adequate for rejection. According to the Panel the information [REDACTED] STATINTL

[REDACTED]

would never want to be in the position of urging OWI to accept an employee that would be inadequate to their purpose. Nevertheless, I feel that prior to rejecting this applicant the information which OWI considers to be derogatory should at least be clarified. If necessary, it would not seem unreasonable if the applicant were asked by OWI or the Office of Personnel to come in for an interview or to correspond with OWI or with the Office of Personnel to explain the factors in his background with which OWI and/or the Agency could be justifiably concerned.


STATINTL

[REDACTED]

In any event, the Agency should never appear to be in the position of having rejected an applicant because he either brought an EEO complaint through administrative channels or utilized the court system to adjudicate such an allegation.

I expect to bring my concerns to the attention of the Director of OWI and urge that you pursue the clarification of this matter by whatever means you consider appropriate.

STATINTL


Omego J. C. Ware, Jr.
Director
Equal Employment Opportunity

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET				
Approved For Release 2001/07/30 : CIA-RDP79-00498A000500140007-4				
SUBJECT: (Optional)			Executive Registry 76-2686	
FROM: F. W. M. Janney Director of Personnel 5E 58, Headquarters		EXTENSION	NO.	
			DATE 28 June 1976 STATINTL	
TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)	DATE		OFFICER'S INITIALS	COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)
	RECEIVED	FORWARDED		
1. DDCI-Designate 7E12 HQS				Mr. [REDACTED] STATINTL
2.				<p>The attached memorandum from Mr. Ware to Chief, Staff Personnel Division, Office of Personnel pretty much summarizes the situation. The Office of Personnel has not been directly involved in this case so we can add nothing of substance.</p> <p>The Applicant Review Panel is made up of representatives from the Office of Security, the Office of Medical Services, and the Office of Personnel. Cases are brought before the Panel by any one of its members. The Panel looks at the entire file and normally makes a recommendation to the Director of Personnel as to the overall suitability of an applicant. In this case, they did not, but apparently went back to the office of immediate interest, i.e., OWI. OWI then withdrew their interest in the applicant.</p> <p>As you know, before a minority applicant is rejected by the Agency, the file goes through D/EE0. That is how Mr. Ware got involved.</p>
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				
13.				
14.				
15.				